

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5 stand rejected under § 102 on the basis of JP '104, JP '338, JP '904, JP '716, JP '609 or JP '777. Applicants traverse this rejection because none of the cited references disclose (or suggest) circular loop portions having a reformed portion with a curvature smaller than that of the circular portions, as in amended independent claims 1 and 5.

All of the cited references except JP '104 do not have distorted loop portions. Fig. 1(b) of JP '104 shows a cord 14 having loop portions, but each loop has a reformed portion shaped in a pointed form, i.e., the reformed portions have a larger curvature than the loop portions.

Claims 1 and 5 define reformed portions having a smaller curvature (or larger radius of curvature). New independent claim 10 defines reformed portions which are almost (straight) linear. These reformed portions are not shown in JP '104, JP '338, JP '904, JP '716, JP '609 or JP '777. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5 stand rejected under § 102 on the basis of Nehr '490, Bachmann et al. '320 or Adams '411. Applicants traverse this rejection for the reasons given with respect to the previous rejection, i.e., because these cited references do not disclose (or suggest) reformed portions having a smaller curvature (i.e., a larger radius of curvature) or reformed portions that are almost straight, as in the present invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is also requested.

Claim 4 stands rejected under § 103 on the basis of JP '104 and Sidles et al. '100, or alternatively, JP '338 and Sidles '100, or JP '904 and Sidles '100, or JP '716 and Sidles '100, or JP '609 and Sidles '100, or JP '777 and Sidles '100. Claim 4 is dependent on claim 1, and applicants traverse for the reasons given with respect to claim 1, and the following reasons.

Sidles discloses reinforcements have elongation values of about 46 % and 48 % at a load of 10 N (about 2lbf). According to the present invention, a preferable range of the elongation at a load of 10 N is 80 % or above, as disclosed in the specification in paragraph [0043]. This range does not fall within the range shown in or by Sidles et al.

The features of the present invention that “the loop portions are circular, and between adjacent circular loops, there is formed a reformed portion having a curvature smaller than that of the circular loop portions” (claims 1 and 5) and that “the loop portions are circular and between adjacent circular loops, there is formed an almost (straight) linear reformed portion” (claim 10) are not shown in the cited references, and the present invention is believed to be novel and non-obvious. For these reasons, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Because the reformed portions are so designed as to have a curvature smaller than that of the loop portions or to be (straight) linear, the flat coil shape can be more easily stabilized. Moreover, stresses tending to be generated when the reinforcement material formed in a flat coil shape is permitted to undergo a deformation can be prevented from undergoing a local concentration and can be homogenized.

In addition to the above, Sidles et al. does not show the applicant's claimed feature that "the low-stress elongation at a load of 10 N is 80 % or more". When a reinforcement material having the above feature is applied to a tire, this material can more easily follow a lifting (diametrically expanding displacement) when the tire is vulcanized, making the material easier to process.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Patrick G. Burns

Registration No. 29,367

June 18, 2007

300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312.360.0080  
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978